

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/585,131	BLIJEVSKY, ALEX	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PHILIP R. SMITH	3779	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) PHILIP R. SMITH. (3) ____.

(2) CALEB POLLACK. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 13 February 2012.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
 ☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Issues Discussed ☐101 ☐112 ☐102 ☐103 ☒Others
 (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 18,20-23,33 and 35-43.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Substance of Interview
 (For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

The application was subject to an election of species requirement. Applicant elected the embodiment of Figure 3A with traverse. Examiner made the restriction final and claims 18, 20-23, 35-37, drawn to the embodiment of Figure 3B, were withdrawn. Applicant later added new claims 38-43 which were also drawn to the non-elected embodiment, and amended claim 33 to depend on claim 38. Finding the independent claim to be allowable, Examiner sought an Examiner's Amendment through which claims 18, 20-23, 33, and 35-43 would be canceled. Applicant requested clarification of the election requirement. Examiner responded that a photodetector located on an outside surface of the capsule necessitated a different search than a light emitter located on an outside surface of the capsule, and moreover, that a processor for gleaning luminance data from a photodetector necessitated a different search than a processor gleaning luminance data and image data from an imager while successfully distinguishing the one from the other.

Applicant recordation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/PHILIP R SMITH/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3779	
---	--